INDIANA STATE RECOUNT COMMISSION MEETING

INDIANA STATE HOUSE

200 WEST WASHINGTON STREET

ROOM 233

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204

DECEMBER 10, 2006 1:30 P.M.

WM. F. DANIELS d/b/a
ACCURATE REPORTING OF INDIANA
12922 Brighton Avenue
Carmel, Indiana 46032
(317) 848-0088

BOARD MEMBERS:

Todd Rokita, Chairman Gordon Durnil Ed Delaney

ALSO PRESENT:

Bradley W. Skolnik, Esq. J. Bradley King, Esq. Kristi L. Robertson, Esq.

December 10, 2006 1:30 p.m.

1.3

2.1

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: I'll call the meeting of the Indiana Recount Commission to order. Please stand and face our flag, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Thank you and welcome, everyone. I'll try to get you back to regularly scheduled programming as soon as possible, whether you're a Bears fan or a Colts fan. I note for the record that we have properly noticed meeting information here that was posted December 6th at 1:30 conforming to the Open Door Law, so I'll note that for the record.

And moving right along, consideration of matters pending before the Recount Commission. We were due to start the House District 15 hearing today, which would have been a hearing on the disputed ballots that were recounted in House District 15. I'll turn it over to Bradley Skolnik, our recount director, for a report.

MR. SKOLNIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you indicated, we were to begin a recount today, the formal recount by this commission, in connection with

2.3

2.2

2)

2 4

2.4

House District 15. That matter, as you noted, was properly noticed and the proceedings were scheduled to begin at this time, at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Yesterday, however, a motion to dismiss the verified petition for recount was filed by the petitioner,

Terri Pasierb, who filed this petition in her capacity as the chairperson of the Newton County

Democratic Central Committee. A copy of that motion has been distributed to the members of the commission.

In addition, shortly thereafter, the respondent, Donald Lehe, through his counsel, filed a motion to join in the motion to dismiss the recount proceedings. So those are the matters that are before this commission at the present time.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Thank you. Any questions from commission members or comments? Hearing none, advice of counsel, we have no choice, I would imagine, but to grant the dismissal.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, under Indiana Code 3-12-11-12, Subsection (e), whenever the petitioner and each cross-petitioner or respondent file a joint motion of the sort that Mr. Skolnik described to dismiss a recount, the commission shall rule on a motion to

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

dismiss before ordering or continuing with a recount or contest.

MR. SKOLNIK: Mr. Chairman, I will note that the State Board of Accounts has -- had prepared its report, pursuant to statute, in anticipation of today's hearing. A copy of that report has been distributed to the members of the commission and majority and minority counsel. In addition, representatives of the State Board of Accounts are here today if there are any questions or any inquiry that this commission may have. I should note that I've been advised by counsel, and I totally agree, that because of the fact that a joint petition for dismissal has been filed, that the initial tally as reflected by the canvass of the counties is what will forever be the official record in this case. Possibly counsel could elaborate on that.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, commission members, that's basically correct. Ms. Robertson and I, wearing our co-directors of the Election Division hat, performed the official canvass for state legislative offices on November the 28th setting forth the figures each of the candidates received in this district. If the commission grants the joint motion to dismiss, then that official canvass will

25

2.4

stand as the final count that the candidates received in this race.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: So there's a motion to dismiss. Any other comments or questions from the commission members? Hearing none, all in favor of granting that motion -- well, can I have a second?

COMMISSIONER DELANEY: I'll move that we grant the motion.

COMMISSIONER DURNIL: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: All in favor?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Hearing no opposed, so moved.

That's unanimously granted. Now I'd like to just very briefly recognize the State Board of Accounts for their report here. As a matter of election administration, it might help to have on record the reason for the difference in the vote count and what was the difference in the vote count, to see if there's anything that would help improve elections in the future in District 15.

MR. ROGINA: I think the net difference of what we tallied --

MR. SKOLNIK: Mike, you may want to --

MR. ROGINA: Mr. Chairman, commission members, as you can see from our tally, there was 7 votes

10 11

12

1.3 14

15

16

18

17

19 20

2.1

2.2

2.3

24

25

added to Donald Lehe and 8 to Myron Sutton totals. Those were a result of absentees, as far as I can tell at this point. We actually counted more than what they had. The tally certified by the county included everything that they thought should be included by the ending date, but when we verified the totals and actually had the ballots, we wound up with that difference, which was a net difference of 1.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Net difference of 1, and that's 8 more for Mr. Lehe and 7 more for Mr. Sutton?

MR. ROGINA: 7 more for Lehe and 8 for Sutton.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Okay. And they were all in the absentee recount?

MR. ROGINA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Was it simply a matter of a miscount or were there more found or --

MR. ROGINA: I suppose you could say that. had some provisional ballots, but I didn't have a chance to run through this before coming in.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Okay. Any questions from the commission members? Hearing none, thank you very We appreciate the State Board of Accounts' work not only on this recount but the other ones that you've been involved in. Thank you very much.

MR. ROGINA: Thank you.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Okay. We will have a

continued meeting now, unless you two want to propose

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Also, for the record, I'd like counsel to explain why we needed to meet in person today to do this dismissal. I don't want to put you any more on the spot there, but in the future process, if there's a way that we can do this by sending around a motion for the three of us to sign or not.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I can address that.

The Recount Commission is covered by the Open Door

Law, as any other state agency is. And the Open Door

Law requires, with the exception of the Indiana Bond

Bank, the physical presence of a quorum of commission

members, in this case, to transact business. The

further complication or further aspect of this is

that although the commission acted under Order 2006-1

to delegate a large amount of authority to the

recount director, one of the items that cannot be

delegated by the commission to the director is the

final determination of a recount contest. And I'd

view a motion to dismiss as falling into that

category.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Thank you, Counsel.

MS. ROBERTSON: And I agree with Brad.

2.4

legislation. One final matter on District 15. I am very pleased, seeing the State Board of Accounts' numbers, that the process worked. The vote count was fair and it was accurate. I understand there have been some changes, but when you have that many people in that many counties looking at the ballots, I think what — the results we're seeing here are relatively around what we call being human. And I'm proud to see that the process worked, the law worked, and because of the great work of the people in this room, the recount process worked here.

I'm also pleased that the parties recognize that in Indiana, because of our election laws and recount laws, they saw the mountain to move here, so to speak, and I do believe they did the right thing in the interests of the taxpayers. Any comments? Thank you very much. I'll turn it over now to Mr. Skolnik for scheduling.

MR. SKOLNIK: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, as you know, there are still a number of recount and contest petitions still pending before this body. A formal notice of meeting has been issued for this commission to reconvene on Tuesday at 1:00 p.m. in Conference Room A of the Government Center. That's located in the Government

1 31 4

Center South. Again, that will be at 1:00 p.m.

At that time, it is my understanding that this body will take up the recount and contest petition that has been filed in Indiana House District 97. It is our anticipation that pursuant to -- as you will see when the agenda is distributed for that meeting, we will note House District 97, as well as the other pending matters, which include the count and contest in House District 31 and the contest proceeding in House District 69.

In addition, the formal tally has yet to be initiated in connection with the U.S. Senate race where Mr. Osborn has requested there be a recount in ten districts -- I'm sorry -- in ten precincts. It should be noted that this commission is not statutorily required to conclude the recount and proceedings in that U.S. Senate race by the December 19th deadline. So in terms of setting scheduling priorities, obviously, with regards to the State Board of Accounts, as well as this body, we're obviously taking the House districts in order.

As I noted, the agenda will be kind of an omnibus agenda that will reflect all the pending matters -- the consideration of matters by this body will include all of these recounts in the various

2.4

House districts. It is my anticipation that this body will proceed from day to day and recess at the end of the day so that they can begin their deliberations immediately the very next day.

As I indicated, we will begin with House
District 97 on Tuesday afternoon at 1:00 p.m. The
next matter that this body would consider would be
House District 31. I will keep counsel for both
parties advised of the progress we're making in House
District 97 so that they will be ready to go. If I
had to project, I would assume we will not get to
House District 31 until later in the week. Probably
Thursday at the earliest and most likely probably on
Friday. But it's always very hard to predict the
time that will be necessary in order to conduct the
hearing in House District 97.

I also want to bring you up-to-date on developments in connection with the petition for recount and contest that was filed in House District 69 by the petitioner Mr. Bright. During the recount -- during the tallying by the State Board of Accounts, we were informed by Mr. Bright and his counsel that they were dismissing or will be dismissing the recount component of their petition. They have not formally filed that yet, but they will

be, I'm sure, doing that shortly.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

In House District 69, the petitioner has not dismissed the contest component of it. They are still assessing whether they want to proceed with that. No final determination has been made in connection with whether they will be proceeding with the contest portion of this matter. I will keep the commission members apprised of developments in connection with that matter. Obviously, if they continue to pursue — the petitioners continue to pursue the contest in House District 69, the hearing in connection with that would follow the deliberations in House District 31.

COMMISSIONER DELANEY: Has the State Board of Accounts done the reports in all the districts?

MR. SKOLNIK: They have the report on this one completed because of the fact that the hearing was scheduled to commence today. They will be completing their reports and I'll let Mr. Rogina speak to that if he would like. It's my understanding they will be completing the reports this week in connection with House District 31 and House District 97. And that's -- House District 97 proceedings commence at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, so I'm sure you'll have that to us in plenty of time.

MR. ROGINA: I'll have that by the morning of 1 Wednesday. 2. MR. SKOLNIK: Or Tuesday? 3 MR. ROGINA: Or Tuesday. Or tomorrow. 4 COMMISSIONER DURNIL: Did the count in 69 stop 5 when they said they were --6 MR. SKOLNIK: The count in 69 did stop when 7 they --8 COMMISSIONER DURNIL: But they haven't filed 9 a --10 MR. SKOLNIK: They have not formally filed it 11 yet, but they asked us to stop --12 CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Brad, would you ask them that 1.3 the commission would like to see that dismissal? 14 MR. SKOLNIK: I will direct them to do so. I'11 15 let them know that the commission is a little -- more 16 than a little bit concerned that it has not received 17 a formal filing on that. 18 CHAIRMAN ROKITA: The commissioners and I were 19 talking before we commenced the meeting, and I want 20 to put that on record, too. We were wondering if 2.1 it's better to start in these races where we have a 2.2 contest and a recount or if it's better to start with 2.3 the recount and that would resolve some -- may 2.4 resolve some contest issues, and/or is it better to 25

2.4

start with the contest side first. And I wondered if counsel, for the record, could comment.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, to speak from my own personal opinions, it's fact-sensitive. Depends on the nature of the contest allegations. If a contest allegation proven on its own would require the remedy for a contest, meaning a special election, then it might make sense for the contest portion to proceed first. However, if the recount portion involves enough ballots so that the mistake alleged in the contest would be rendered but would not change the result, then it makes sense to do the recount first.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Kristi.

MS. ROBERTSON: The only thing that I would add is that I think in the past when we've had recount contests, a lot of times we have started with a recount because it may -- the contest portion may become irrelevant if --

MR. KING: Right. And I'd add that that has been the past practice of the commission, to generally begin recounts first.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Mr. Skolnik, what's your advice for 97?

MR. SKOLNIK: Based on counsel's advice and their comments today, I would recommend that we begin

2.4

with the recount, especially in a matter such as

House District 97 where the margin is rather narrow,

and I suppose it's always conceivable that once the

recount is completed, that the request for a contest

may be mooted. I don't know that for sure.

One thing I will do, and I think it would be beneficial if the commission will authorize me to do so, is I can consult with counsel for both parties to try and get a better feel for the issues that will be presented, as well as what their preferences may be. Obviously, it's up to this commission to make the determination as to whether to start with the recount first or with the contest. I think, based on what we know now, it would be my recommendation that we begin initially with the recount. If I find, based on my inquiry, that my opinion and recommendation would change, I will contact the commission members immediately.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Is that all right? Okay.

Please proceed that way, Brad. Thank you very much.

Any additional matters before the commission?

COMMISSIONER DELANEY: What's our time schedule on Tuesday? How long are we going to run?

MR. SKOLNIK: We begin Tuesday at 1:00 p.m. I think certainly it's up to this commission to

1 4

2.2

2.4

_ -

25 to

determine how long to run with the proceeding on that day. Based on the fact that a contest, as well as a recount, can be a time-consuming endeavor, I would certainly encourage this commission, if at all possible, to be willing to go into the evening hours and not necessarily recess at the close of the business day.

COMMISSIONER DURNIL: How many challenged votes are there in 97?

MR. SKOLNIK: I don't know what the number is at the present time. I don't know if the State Board of Accounts has formally tallied that --

MR. ROGINA: We are still in the process of tabulating our results.

MR. SKOLNIK: And Commissioner Durnil, there are -- I know there were several entire precincts challenged. As we know, as parties go through the process, sometimes they exercise what I'll call an abundance of caution and make sure they formally challenge a precinct or a large number of votes that they may not necessarily present to the commission for a final determination.

CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Any other questions for the commission? Thank you. I'll entertain a motion to --

1	MR. SKOLNIK: Just one final note. I will be
2	and I assume that I'll have the blessing of this
3	commission I will be rescinding the order of
4	impoundment in House District 15 now that this matter
5	is concluded.
6	CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Do you need an order to do
7	that?
8	MR. SKOLNIK: I'm empowered to do that based on
9	your enabling order.
10	CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Then I'll need a motion to
11	adjourn this one and recess the other one?
12	MR. SKOLNIK: That is correct.
13	COMMISSIONER DURNIL: So moved.
14	CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Seconded?
15	COMMISSIONER DELANEY: Second.
16	CHAIRMAN ROKITA: So moved.
17	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
18	CHAIRMAN ROKITA: Hearing no opposed, so moved.
19	
2.0	(Proceedings adjourned.)
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
2.5	

STATE OF INDIANA)

(COUNTY OF BOONE)

I, Tavi L. Fraga, RPR, a Notary Public in and for the State of Indiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken down in stenographic notes and afterwards reduced to typewriting under my direction, and that the typewritten transcript is a true record of the proceedings to the best of my ability;

I do further certify that I am a disinterested person in this matter, that I am not a relative or attorney of any of the parties, or otherwise interested in the event of this matter, and am not in the employ of any of the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 19th day of December, 2006.

Tavi L. Fraga, RPR, Notary Public Residing in Boone County, Indiana

My Commission Expires: February 8, 2010

TAVI L. FRAGA
Printed Signature